DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 219 138 PS 012 951

AUTHOR Kralj, M. M.; And Others
TITLE The Measurement of Parenting Locus of Control.
SPONS AGENCY Maryland Univ., College Park. Computer Science Center.
PUB DATE [81]
NOTE 29p.; Also supported in part by the University of Maryland Graduate Research Board.

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS *Locus of Control; *Measures (Individuals); *Parent Attitudes; Parent Child Relationship; *Test Construction; *Test Reliability; *Test Validity
IDENTIFIERS *Parenting Locus Of Control Scale

ABSTRACT

The present study describes the construction of a scale for reliably measuring the extent to which parents form generalized expectancies of the degree to which their children's behaviors are contingent on their own actions as parents. The original 72 statements included in the Parenting Locus of Control (PLOC) scale ascribed cause to one of four domains: parent control, child control, other control (such as that held by peers, siblings, teachers, etc.), and chance control (i.e., fate or luck). Each domain yielded a separate subscale score. Within each subscale an equal number of items dealing with positive and negative outcomes was included, and the attempt was made to represent situations specific to parent/child exchanges concerning home life, school, and health. The PLOC demonstrated good internal consistency and 3-week test-retest stability for two subscales: parent control and chance control. Preliminary evidence for construct validity indicated that the chance control subscale constitutes a parenting-specific measure of expectancy for locus of control independent of social desirability. The parent control subscale did not relate to locus of control but may reflect harmony or absence of conflict in the parent/child dyad. PLOC scores did not differ with regard to age or gender of the parent. The scale produced sufficient evidence of reliability and validity to warrant further development as a research tool. Theoretical and applied aspects of the construct and measure are discussed. (Author/RH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED219138

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

The Measurement of Parenting Locus of Control

M.M. Kralj, Philip Magenheim, and Alissa Jones-Cady

University of Maryland - College Park

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Mary M. Kralj

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

PS 012951

Running head: Parenting Locus of Control

Abstract

Researchers have proposed a cognitive mediational approach to investigate parent-child interactions which recognizes parents as active information processors. Such an approach highlights the importance of parental expectations, beliefs and knowledge in the interactive process. The present study developed a measure of generalized expectancy for parents based on the social learning theory construct of locus of control. The Parenting Locus of Control Scale (PLOC) was constructed as a multidimensional measure and has demonstrated good internal consistency and three-week test-retest stability for two subscales, Parent control and Chance control. Preliminary evidence for construct validity indicated that the Chance control subscale constitutes a parenting-specific measure of expectancy for locus of control independent of social desirability. The Parent control subscale did not relate to locus of control but may reflect harmony or absence of conflict in the parent-child dyad. PLOC scores did not differ with regard to age or gender of the parent. The scale produced sufficient evidence of reliability and validity to warrant further development as a research tool. Theoretical and applied implications for the construct and the measure as discussed.

The Measurement of Parenting Locus of Control

The Current emphasis on the reciprocal nature of parent-child relationships has strongly influenced the methods used to investigate the process of childrearing. One striking methodological change in parent-child research has been the shift from an earlier reliance on parent self-reported behaviors to the more recent emphasis on direct observational studies of parent-child interactions. Parke (1978, 1979) has argued that the narrow use of observation in the absence of other sources of data oversimplifies the interactive process and may inadvertantly imply that parents respond to their offspring in a stimulus-response fashion. Citing numerous studies to demonstrate that parents form expectations, beliefs and stereotypes which influence their behavior with children, Parke has recommended that researchers develop and use systematic measures of parental cognitions to supplement the direct observation of parent-child interactions. While it is clear that parents are active information processors, the dimensions along which they form expectations and beliefs are not yet systematically defined.

Although parent-specific cognition is a relatively new area of research, the influence of cognitive mediation on behavior has been a central aspect of both attribution and social learning theories for some time (Heider, 1958; Kelley & Michela, 1980; Rotter, Chance & Phares, 1972; Weiner & Kun, 1976). In particular, the locus of control construct has emerged as one important dimension in the study of cognitive mediation of behavior. Locus of control, first developed by Rotter (1966), is a generalized expectancy variable reflecting the degree to which an

individual perceives events as consequent to his/her own behavior (internal locus) or as the result of chance or indluences beyond personal control (external locus). Internals and externals have demonstrated behavioral differences in a number of areas including response to stress, coping behaviors, achievement efforts, response to therapy and preventive health activities (Coppel & Smith, 1980; Lefcourt, 1980; Murray & Staebler, 1974; Ross, Bierbrauer, & Polly, 1974; Strickland, 1977; 1978).

Generalized expectancy has also been examined in contexts more specific to adult-child relationships. Several studies indicate that internal teachers produce higher levels of academic achievement among their students than external teachers (Murray & Staebler, 1974; Rose, 1981; Vasquez, 1973). To specify the behavioral differences between internal and external teachers which might account for variations in student outcome, Rose and Medway (1981) examined the relationship between teachres' Rotter I-E scores and a number of discrete teacher behavior variables. Although they did confirm that student achievement was related to teacher generalized locus of control, they were unable to demonstrate any significant differences in instructional or disciplinary style between internal and external teachers. Thus, studies confirm a relationship between adult generalized expectancies and child outcome but do not yet clarify the process by which it occurs. This may reflect the theoretical notion that locus of control does not exert a direct influence on behavior but must be considered in the context of additional personal characteristics, reinforcement value and situational contingencies (Rotter, 1975).

Using a standard task which imposed a consistent set of situational contingencies, Mondell and Tyler (1981) demonstrated a relationship between parents' generalized locus of control and their actual behaviors while interacting with their preschool age offspring. They found that parents identified as competent on the basis of internality, trustfulness and an active planful coping style, measured by the Rotter I-E (Rotter, 1966), the Rotter Trust Scale (Rotter, 1967) and the Behavioral Attributes of Psychosocial Competence (Tyler, 1978) respectively, demonstrated a particular style of behavior with their children. The competent parents' behaviors were characterized by greater use of indirect solutions, helpful suggestions, and acceptance as well as fewer commands and less verbal disapproval. While the study did not include an assessment of child outcome it did demonstrate that parental behavior can relate in part to their generalized expectancies for locus of control.

Thus the generalized expectancy for locus of control appears to be a useful and measurable dimension of cognitive mediation which is related to both behaviors and outcomes. Furthermore, it appears to be applicable to adult and specifically parent-child behaviors. However, the strength of the relationship between expectancy and behavior varies considerably across studies. Various authors have proposed that such variability in results reflects the multidimensionality of the construct and the situational specificity with which it predicts behavior.

Initial measures of I-E proposed a unidimensional construct in which internality and externality were extremes on a single factor.

Later analyses of the original Rotter instrument and other scales suggest several separate factors (Gurin, Gurin, Lao & Beattie, 1969; Mirels, 1970; Phares, 1976; 1978; Reid & Ware, 1973; 1974). For example, Levenson (1973a,b; Levenson & Muller, 1976) in a modification of the Rotter scale found three factors: belief in internal control, chance control and control of powerful others. Whether locus of control is better conceived of as uni-dimensional or multi-dimensional has yet to be established since the factors suggesting multidimensionality do not remain constant across populations or gender (Strickland, 1977).

In addition, other investigators have emphasized the situational specificity of the I-E construct and recommend that locus of control scales should be constructed specific to the situational characteristics under study (Lefcourt, 1980; Phares, 1976; 1978). Several situation specific scales such as the Intellectual Achievement Responsibility Questionnaire (Crandall, Katkovsky & Crandall, 1965), the Health Locus of Control Scale (Wallston, Maides & Wallston, 1976) and the Teacher's Locus of Control Scale (Rose & Medway, 1981) have shown improved predictive power. Yet no similar attempts have been made to systematically investigate the applicability of the construct specific to the parent-child relationship. Do parents form generalized expectancies of the degree to which their children's behaviors are contingent on their own actions as parents? Can such a parent-specific locus of control orientation be reliably measured? The present study details the empirical efforts to construct a scale with which to reliably measure parenting specific locus of control.

Parenting Locus of Control Scale (PLOC)

The PLOC was constructed as a series of statements with which an individual indicated degree of agreement or disagreement along a 4 point Likert Scale. Statements were chosen which ascribed cause to one of four domains: 1) Parent control 2) Child control 3) Other control (such as peers, siblings, teachers, etc.) and 4) Chance control (fate or luck). Each domain yielded a separate subscale score. Within each subscale an equal number of items dealt with positive and negative outcomes and an effort was made to represent situations specific to parent-child exchanges concerning home life, school and health. Thus, the scale was designed to tap several dimensions along which parents could ascribe control of their child's behavior since this appeared to reflect better the potential range of responses. The original version of the scale consisted of 72 items. Reliability and validity data concerning the scale were collected in two separate studies reported in the remainder of this paper.

Method

Subjects. Subjects who participated in Study 1 were recruited from local day care centers and from undergraduate developmental psychology courses. Of these 292 subjects, 101 were parents, and only one parent per family (usually the mother) was included in the sample. Subjects were predominantly middle class and female. The majority of respondents were white.

The 112 subjects who participated in Study 2 were contacted through local community centers, summer day camps and private schools. All subjects in the second study were parents and 37 mother-father pairs were represented in the sample. Parents participating in the second study were all white

and upper middle class. Fathers comprised nearly one-third of the respondents in the second sample. Summaries of the demographic characteristics of subjects in each study are provided in Table 1.

Insert Table 1 about here

Procedures. The subjects in Study 1 were interviewed individually at the agency from which they were recruited. The completed a series of paper and pencil self-report measures including the original 72 item PLOC Scale, the Marlowe-Crowne Scale of Social Desirability (Crowne & Marlowe, 1964), the Rotter I-E scale (Rotter, 1966) and a series of demographic questions.

Based on analyses conducted for Study 1, the PLOC was revised to a 27-item form which was administered to the subjects in Study 2. The parents in this sample were adminstered a battery of measures in their homes, including the 27-item PLOC, the Rotter I-E Scale, and the Causality subscale of the Hereford Parent Attitude Survey (Hereford, 1973). In addition, the PLOC was readministered to 51 subjects after a three week interval to provide test-retest information.

Results

Study 1. To ascertain internal consistency coefficients for the 4 subscales of the PLOC, an item analysis was conducted on the 72-item scale. Those questions which elicited 80% or more agreement were eliminated from the scale. Item-total correlations were calculated between each item and its subscale total. Those items demonstrating poor item-total correlations (.30 or below) were also deleted from the scale. With the remaining 33

items, each subscale was assessed for internal consistency by means of Cronbach's alpha (Nunnally, 1978). Table 2 provides the results of this analysis. All scales demonstrated sufficient internal consistency to warrant further investigation with the exception of the "Other control" scale which demonstrated a low d=.56 based on a sample of only three items. Given the small number of items and low reliability, this scale was dropped from further analyses and the items were deleted from the scale.

Insert Table 2 about here

Since the sample size was insufficient to support a factor analysis of scale items, Pearson product-moment correlations were calculated for each pair of subscale totals to assess the independence of the subscales. To determine the degree to which the subscales reflected a social desirability bias, Pearson product-moment correlations were also conducted between each subscale and the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability total scale score. Finally, the Rotter I-E Scale score was correlated with each subscale score of the PLOC. Table 3 provides a summary of the results of the correlations. The Parent control and Chance subscales of the PLOC showed no significant correlation although the Child control scale moderately correlated with each. Both the Parent control and Chance scales correlated with the Rotter scale such that parents who attributed control to themselves scored more internally on the Rotter and parents endorsing explanations of chance scored externally. The PLOC Chance scale showed no relationhipe to the Marlowe-Crowne score while the Parent control scale did demonstrate a low but significant correlation with social desirability.

Insert Table 4 about here

Since mothers and fathers from the same family provided PLOC scores in 37 cases, Pearson product-moment correlations were calculated between mother and father scores to determine the degree to which parent answers were interdependent. Mother and father scores did not correlate significantly on either the Parent control)r=.20, N=37, p=ns) or on the Chance scale (r=.02, N=37, p=ns). Since there was no evidence of systematic responses between mothers and fathers, both sets of data for the 37 cases were included in all subsequent analyses.

Fifty-one of the orignial subjects were readminstered the PLOC three weeks after their initial interview. Pearson product-moment correlations were calculated between the test and re-test scores which demonstrated that the Parent control scale (r=.76, M=51, p .01) and Chance scale (r=.71, N-51, p .01) scores remained stable over that time interval.

To provide a preliminary assessment of construct validity, the parent control and luck scales were correltated with each other by means of a Pearson product-moment correlation and each scale was then correlated with the Rotter I-E score and the Causality subscale of the Hereford Parent Survey (a scale designed to assess the degree to which parents believe that they are active agents in their child's lives as opposed to seeing their children's behavior as a product of uncontrollable forces such as fate or genetic determination). The results are given in Table 5, and indicate that, consistent with Study 1, the Parent control and Chance scales do not reflect opposite ends of a single continuum but appear to be quite independent of each other. The Chance scale demonstrated a

pattern of significant relationships with both the Hereford Causality and the Rotter I-E scales which suggests that it does measure a generalized expectancy specific to parent-child relationships. This is also strengthened by the absence of any significant correlation between the Herford Causality scale and the Rotter I-E which well may reflect the difference between an expectancy variable and an attitude variable. In contrast however, while the Parent control scale of the PLOC has demonstrated reliability, its failure to correlate with any of the other measures suggests that it is tapping a dimension of parental cognitions that cannot be adequately defined given the data available and will require additional study.

Insert Table 5 about here

Finally, a series of one way univariate analyses of variance were conducted on both the Parent central and Chance scales to determine whether there were any systematic differences in scores related to either gender of age of parents. The results given in Table 6 indicate that mothers do not systematically differ from fathers and that age of parent is not a factor in response patterns.

Insert Table 6 about here

Discussion

Reliability

The findings across both studies demonstrated that the PLOC does reliably measure two dimensions of parental cognitions. The first,

Parent control, reflects the degree to which parents report their children's behaviors as contingent on their own activities as parents. The second dimension, Chance control, assesses the degree to which parents hold an expectancy that their children's behaviors result from chance factors outside the parents' perosnal influence. Both internal consistencies and three-week test-retest stabilities indicate that the measure can reliably measure at least two dimensions of cognitions for parents at a level sufficient for further use as a research tool. The failure of the Child control and Other control scales to meet acceptable standards of reliability may indicate either that the dimensions exist and the items were not capable of measuring them or more likely, parents do not find the child's own control or others control salient to their expectancies as parents. These two scales may measure the parent's views of the child's locus of control and thus their responses vary and are not as central to parent expectanciew as the Parent control and Chance dimensions.

Validity

As Nunnally (1978) has stated, validity is essentially an ongoing process judged in terms of degree rather than absolutes. The validation process poses many specific questions requiring empirical evidence. The primary question asks whether the scale can measure what it intends to measure. Preliminary data from the two studies using the PLOC provided empirical evidence to suggest that it may,

A common threat to the validity of any self-report measure is the tendency for subjects to produce socially desirable responses. This has been a common issue for the Rotter I-E scale of generalized expectancies

which often shows low but significant correlations with independent measures of social desirability response sets, average correlations of -.23 across studies. Data reported in Study 1, however suggests that the PLOC may not be as severaly threatened by this bias. The Chance scale, which most clearly reflects parenting locus of control expectancies, did not show a significant relationship to the Marlowe-Crowne measure of social desirability. The Parent control, which may measure a dimension of parent cognition separate from locus of control, did show a small but significant correlation with the Marlowe-Crowne. However, this relationship was smaller in strength than those usually reported for the Rotter Scale. Thus, based on available data, the PLOC does not appear overly sensitive to social desirability bias.

Furthermore, as would be anticipated for an expectancy variable, the PLOC scores are quite specific to the individual and do not reflect any systematic differences associated with age or gender of parent. Nor does the measure reflect a systematic relationship between mother and father report, further supporting the assumption that the variable measures an individual report of expectancy and not a shared family perception.

The central validity question involves whether the PLOC measures a generalized expectancy specific to parenting. Results suggest that it indeed does, at least for the Chance subscale. It was hypothesized that a measure of generalized locus of control should bear no particular relationship to a measure of parents' causal beliefs regarding children, but that a parenting specific expectancy should share a relationship with both the Rotter I-E since it proposes to be a locus of control scale, and should also relate to the content of the parent causal beliefs

measure. This pattern was supported by the data from Study 2. While the Rotter I-E and Hereford Causality scale were not significantly correlated, the PLOC Chance scale did demonstrate a moderate and significant relationship with both in the expected direction, suggesting that the Chance scale does measure a generalized expectancy specific to the causal influence parents believe they have with their children.

The question of validity is considerably less clear, however, concerning the Parent control scale. Since this scale was constructed to assess parent's direct report of control, it was anticipated that it would show a strong negative relationship to the Chance scale. However, the data across both Study 1 and 2 demonstrated that the Parent control and Chance scales are independent of one another. The failure of the Parent control scale to correlate significantly with either the Rotter I-E or the Hereford causality scales, suggests that the subscale does not consititute a generalized expectancy related to parent causal beliefs, despite the intuitive appeal of such an idea. Although the data available is not capable of determining preliminary construct validity at the time, Lewis (1981) has proposed a very interesting reinterpretation of parental control which may explain the nature of this scale.

In her review of parental control, Lewis draws attention to an apparent conflict between parent control research which suggests such control promotes effective child internalization (Baumrind, 1973; Maccoby, 1980) and those socialization and attribution studies which find salient external control to be negatively associated with internalization of standards (Lepper, 1973; Dienstbier, 1978). She proposes that parent control be reinterpreted as a measure of the child's willingness to obey,

and as such is a parental measure of harmony or absence of conflict in the parent-child relationship. If this reinterpretation is applicable to the PLOC parent control scale, it may well explain the association of that scale with socially desirable responses. Lewis' line of reasoning provides a promising direction for continues validity work with this particular PLOC subscale.

Summary

The PLOC Scale has shown promising evidence of reliability and validity which warrants its continues use as a research tool. The scale reflects two dimensions of parental cognitions, one a parent specific generalized expectancy of locus of control and the other, a measure of parent reported control which bears further examination. Continued validation is called for at this time, specifically to determine the relationship of the PLOC to child outcome and actual parent behavior. It is anticipated that the PLOC will whow a stronger predictive relationship to both child and parent variables related to childrearing than has been possible with the more general Rotter I-E scale.

In addition, the parenting specific locus of control scale may shed light on both theoretical and applied questions. In terms of theory, it may prove useful in addressing an essential puzzle central to child socialization. That is, if it is true that a sense of control is crucial to competent behavior, how can a parent-child unit operate so that both the parent and the child perceive themselves as maintaining an internal locus of control? Finally, in terms of applied relevance, the locus of control construct may open new avenues with which to investigate those parenting systems that go avay in instances such as child abuse,

delinquency and runaway behavior. In summary, the Parenting Locus of Control Scale provides a working research tool with which to explore at least one dimension of parent cognitive mediation - its nature and influence on childrearing.

References

Baumrind, D. The development of instrumental competence through socialization. In A.D. Pick (Ed.), Minnesota Symposia on Child Psychology (Vol. 7). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1973.

Coppel, D.B. & Smith, R.E. Acquisition of stimulus-outcome and response-outcome as a function of locus of control. Cognitive Therapy and Research, 1980, 4, 179-188.

Crandall, V.C., Katkovsky, W. & Crandall, V.J. Children's beliefs in their own control of reinforcement in intellectual academic achievement situations, Child Development, 1965, 39, 91-109.

Crowne, D.P. & Marlowe, D. The Approval Motive: Studies in evaluative dependence. New York: Wiley, 1964.

Dienstbier, R.A. Attribution, socialization, and moral decision making. In J.H. Harvey, W. Ickes, R.F. Kidd (Eds.), New Directions in Attribution Research (Vol. 2). Hillsdale, N.J.: Erlbaum, 1978.

Gurin, P., Gurin, G., Lao, R., & Beattie, M. Internal-external control in the motivational dynamics of Negro youth. Journal of Social Issues, 1969, 25, 29-53.

Heider, F. The Psychology of Interpersonal Relations. New York: Wiley, 1958.

Hereford, C.F. Changing Parental Attitudes through Group Discussion. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1973.

Kelley, H.H. & Michela, J.L. Attribution theory and research. Annual Review of Psychology, 1980, 31, 457-501.

Lefcourt, H.M. Locus of control and coping with life evetns. In E. Stauls (Ed.) Personality: Basic aspects and current research. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1980.

Lepper, M.R. Dissonance, self-perception, and honesty in children. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1973, 25, 65-74.

Levenson, H. Multidimensional locus of control in psychiatric patients. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1973(a), 41, 397-404.

Levenson, H. Perceived parental antecedents of internal, powerful others and chance locus of control orientations. Developmental Psychology, 1973(b), 9, 260-265.

Levenson, H. & Miller, J. Multidimensional locus of control in sociopolitical ideologies. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1976, 33, 199-208.

Lewis, C.C. The effects of parental firm control: A reinterpretation of findings. Psychological Bulletin, 1981, 90, 547-566.

Maccoby, E. Social Development, New York: Harcourt, Brace, Javanoorch, Inc., 1980.

Mirels, H.L. Dimensions of internal versus external control. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1970, 34, 226-228.

Mondell, S. & Tyler, F.B. Parental competence and styles of problem solving/play behavior with children. Developmental Psychology, 1981, 17, 73-78.

Murray, H. & Staebler, B.K. Teacher's locus of control and student achievement gains. Journal of School Psychology, 1974, 12, 305-309.

Nunnally, J.C. Psychometric Theory. 2nd Ed. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1978.

Parke, R.D. Parent-infant interaction: Progress, paradigms, and problems. In G.P. Sackett (Ed.) Observing Behavior, Vol. I. Baltimore: University Park Press, 1978.

Parke, R.D. Perspectives on Father-infant interaction. In J.D. Osofsky (Ed.) Handbook of Infant Development. New York: Wiley, 1979.

Phares, E.J. Locus of Control in Personality. Morristown, N.J.: General Learning Press, 1976.

Phares, E.J. Locus of control. In H. London & J.E. Exner (Eds.) Dimensions of Personality. New York: Wiley, 1978.

Ried, D.W. & Ware, E.E., Multidimensionality of internal-external control: Implications for past and future research. Canadian Journal of Behavioral Science, 1974, 6, 131-142.

Rose, J.S. Relationship among teacher locus of control, teacher and student behavior, and student achievement. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of South Carolina, 1978.

Rose, L., Bierbrauer, G. & Polly, S. Attribution of educational outcomes by professional and nonprofessional instructors. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1974, 29, 609-618.

Ross, L., Bierbrauer, G. & Polly, S. Attribution of educational outcomes by professional and nonprofessional instructors. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1974, 29, 609-618.

Rotter, J.B. Generalized expectancies for internal versus external control of reinforcement. Psychological Monographs, 1966, 80, No. 609.

Rotter, J.B. A new scale for the measurement of interpersonal trust, Journal of Personality, 1967, 35, 651-665.

Rotter, J.B. Some problems and misconceptions related to the construct of internal versus external control of reinforcement. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1975, 43, 56-67.

Rotter, J.B., Chance, J. & Phares, E.J. (Eds.) Applications of a Social Learning Theory of Personality, New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1972.

Strickland, B.R. Internal-external control of reinforcement. In T. Blass (Ed.) Personality Variables in Social Behavior. Hillsdale, N.J.: Erlbaum, 1977.

Strickland, B.R. Internal-external expectancies and health-related behaviors. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1978, 46, 1192-1211.

Tyler, F.B. Individual psychosocial competence: A personality configuration. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 1978, 38, 309-323.

Vasque, J. The relation of teacher locus of control to teacher characteristics and student learning gains. Doctoral dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles, 1973.

Weiner, B. & Kun, A. The development of causal attributions and the growth of achievement and social motivation. In A. Feldman & D. Bush (Eds.) Cognitive Development and Social Development. Hillsdale, N.J.: Erlbaum, 1976.

Wallston, K.A., Maides, S., Wallston, B.S. Health-related information seeking as a function of health-related locus of control and health value. Journal of Research on Personality, 1976, 10, 215-222.

Footnotes

This paper was supported in part by funds from the University of Maryland Graduate Research Board and the University of Maryland Computer Science Center.

Appreciation is extended to the directors, teachers, staff, and parents who participated in the study from the following institutions:

Their cooperation and assistance are gratifully acknowledged.

Requests for reprints should be sent to M.M. Kralj, Department of Psychology, University of Maryland, College Park, MD 20742.

Table 1

Demographic characteristics of subjects in Studies 1 and 2

Characteristic	Study 1	Study 2	
Gender N			
Males	76	40	
Females	216	72	
Age[a]			
$\overline{X}$	30.1	37.2	
SD	11.3	5.5	
Education[a]			
$\overline{X}$	14.7	16.0	
SD	2.6	3.7	
Race N			
White	249	112	
Black	35		
Hispanic	4		
Other	4		
Marital Status N			
Married	69	37	58
Single	203	0	0
Divorced/Separated	20	3	14

a Reported in years.

Table 1 (cont'd)

Demographic characteristics of subjects

in Studies 1 and 2

Characteristic	Study 1	Study 2
Number of Children		
None	191	0
1	36	17
2	41	75
3	14	12
4+	10	8
Age of oldest child[a]		
X	13.1	11.0
SD	9.6	7.6

Table 2

Cronbach's alpha Study 1

Scale	Cronbach's alpha (N of items)
Parent control	.69 (7)
Child control	.65 (11)
Other control	.56 (3)
Chance	.73 (9)

Table 3

Pearson product-moment correlations Study 1

	P-LOC Parent Control	P-LOC Child Control	P-LOC Luck	Marlowe Crowne[a] social Desir.	Rotter[b] I-E Scale
P-LOC Parent control	X	.30** (N=292)	.02 (N=292)	.17* (N=164)	-.12* (N=164)
P-LOC Child control	X	X	.24** (N=292)	.02 (N=164)	.03 (N=164)
P-LOC Chance	X	X	X	.07 (N=164)	.23** (N=164)

* p .05

**p .01

[a]high scores indicate socially desirable responses

[b]high scores indicate an external locus of control

Table 4

Internal consistency for P-LOC scales. Study 2.

Scale	Cronbach's alpha (N=112 Subjects)
Parent control	.67
Child control	.37
Chance	.75

Table 5

Pearson product-moment intercorrelations for the P-LOC, Rotter I-E and Hereford Parent Attitude Survey N=112

	P-LOC Parent control	P-LOC Luck	Rotter[a] I-E	Hereford Parent[b] Causality Attitude
P-LOC Parent control	X	-.11	.01	-.01
P-LOC Chance		X	.31**	-.45**
Rotter I-E			X	-.06
Hereford Parent Causality Attitude				X

** p .-1

[a]high score indicates external locus of control

[b]high score indicates attitude that parent is a causal agent

Table 6

Analysis of variance results for Parent control and Chance scales

Test ANOVA	F	df	p
Gender (Male v. Female)			
Parent conrol	1.41	2	ns
Chance	.69	2	ns
Age (18-30 v. 31-40 v. 41-50)			
Parent control	.86	3	ns
Chance	2.23	3	ns